

Appendix B: Responses to queries relating to Q2 Corporate Performance Report 2022/23 raised at the meeting of the Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 15th December 2022

1. In relation to M918 % calls answered

Query: what are the numbers / timescales for calling back? Are all lines manned? Is the team fully staffed?

Response: demand has increased, and we are putting processes in place to manage this, and we now use call back. We don't record these figures separately and they are relatively small numbers. We utilise call back on Blue Badge, Benefits, Waste and Environmental Health – the option is turned on for these services all the time however they don't get offered the call back option until they have been waiting a certain amount of time in the queue. Currently, this is 5 mins for Blue Badge; 20 mins for Benefits; 15 mins for Environment Health; 15 mins for Waste. They are called back automatically by the system when an agent comes free, or by a member of staff after 5pm. We try to call them back twice where there is no answer, at which point the call back is nulled. We add call back options to other lines depending on yearly activity as and when we assess there to be a requirement.

Calls are answered depending on length of time waiting and the skill set of the available staff, i.e., each member of staff will cover several lines and will be presented with the next call that fits their skill set based on how long the call has been waiting. Lines are not separately manned by specific staff, there is a queueing system as described. Please note that the only exception to this is the Helpline. This is set apart from the Customer Support Centre and this team deal only with those calls unless the line is not busy then they log into the CSC environment. They call back any callers that couldn't get through on first time of trying.

We are up to budget on staff once we have finished the most recent round of recruitment for 3 members of staff. We have recruited several times in the last couple of years and have had mixed success, with issues filling all vacancies in each round. The current cohort will take us up to establishment, but they will likely only start with us end Jan/beginning of February and will need significant training.

2. In relation to M408 / M409 / M410 new homes / affordable homes

Query:

- how do we set a target if we don't build the houses and we are in the hands of planning & developers - how do we allow for planning delays?
- how do we set a target for 'affordable' – if these usually built at the end, what if developer decides they are not viable?
- how do we ensure developers uphold their commitment?

Response: The target for total new homes (M408) is based on the annual housing requirement for Oldham set in the submitted [Places for Everyone Joint Plan](#).

The target set for delivery of affordable homes (M409 and M410) is informed by what the [Local Housing Needs Assessment](#) (published in 2019) states is required to address the imbalance of affordable housing provision in the borough, combined with an estimate of what affordable housing we might achieve through the current planning policies on affordable housing and through sites earmarked for residential development.

It can vary from site-to-site, but affordable homes can be brought forward throughout the development usually, and the Section 106 legal agreement associated with a planning permission can sometimes require that the affordable homes are brought forward by a specified stage of the overall development, and not left until the end.

Once planning permission has been granted, a developer cannot simply decide that it is not viable to deliver the affordable homes – they are required to deliver the affordable homes under the planning permission and, if relevant, the associated Section 106 legal agreement if they choose to go ahead with the overall development. Alternatively, they can re-apply for planning permission and submit a viability appraisal for us to consider agreeing a reduced proportion of affordable homes, though this is rare, as any viability issues have usually been considered thoroughly by the applicant when preparing their original planning application (and then by the Council in determining the application).

However, with regard these measures, we are reliant upon developers to deliver both market and affordable housing and so any delays in the delivery of new homes on a given site can impact the actual figures we achieve against the targets in these measures; we have little or no control over that at present.

3. In relation to M733 % reception get 1-3 choice of place and M 734 % Year 7 get 1-3 choice of place

Query: the report shows 98.4% reception / 91.2% Year 7 get 1-3 choice of place – how are these figures arrived at? Is there a breakdown by ward and / or school to reflect how the numbers are made up?

Response: There is a breakdown by Ward included below. This has not been shared previously as the introduction of Brian Clarke Academy paints a slightly confused picture as the places offered there this year were conditional on the school opening. Next year's figures will be much clearer as we will undertake the allocation for Brian Clarke and the places are unconditional offers so we can rank them properly in terms of preferences.

Table 1: Primary

Ward	Total pupils	Number in good/outstanding	% in good/outstanding
Alexandra	1284	719	56.0%
Waterhead	766	478	62.4%
Failsworth East	801	530	66.2%
Hollinwood	2203	1564	71.0%
Coldhurst	1381	996	72.1%
Werneth	1557	1159	74.4%
Medlock Vale	1329	1014	76.3%
Crompton	1057	845	79.9%
Chadderton Central	1412	1216	86.1%
Chadderton North	1541	1541	100.0%
Chadderton South	1625	1625	100.0%
Failsworth West	1332	1332	100.0%
Royton North	1219	1219	100.0%
Royton South	631	631	100.0%
Saddleworth North	699	699	100.0%
Saddleworth South	1073	1073	100.0%
Saddleworth west & Lees	1336	1336	100.0%
Shaw	765	765	100.0%
St James'	1747	1747	100.0%
St Mary's	1970	1970	100.0%

Table 2: Secondary

Ward	Total pupils	Number in good/outstanding	% in good/outstanding
Chadderton North	1610	0	0%
Failsworth East	1464	0	0%
Hollinwood	1461	0	0%
Saddleworth North	1245	0	0%
Chadderton Central	3004	1507	50%
Crompton	2913	1837	63%
Medlock Vale	1057	1057	100%
Royton South	1327	1327	100%
Saddleworth South	1402	1402	100%
St Mary's	1658	1658	100%

Context:

This data is from two sources, Number on Roll (NOR) is taken from the October school census and Ofsted ratings taken from Nexus and is up to date for inspections completed before 30/11/22.

Table 1 - Shows the % of pupils in good/outstanding schools by ward in primary schools

Table 2 – Shows the % of pupils in good/outstanding schools by ward in secondary schools, this data excludes Oasis Leesbrook (recent Ofsted inspection not reported yet) and Brian Clarke (no Ofsted review)

Issues with the data - This data shows the % of pupils who attend a school located in a ward that is graded good or outstanding. It does not show the percentage of pupils who live in that ward that attend a school that is good or outstanding. St Mary's, for example has 7 schools all rated good or better by Ofsted and therefore shows as 100%.

4. In reference to M 333a % spent in Oldham 12 months rolling.

Query: does this included spend on the community lighting partnership (EoN) - they have a local HQ but are a national company so would contend it is not spent locally. Is the 'Making Fair Decisions' Policy re local spending built into the impact assessment process?

Response: in cases such as this 75% of the spend is spent locally, with 25% going to 'head office'. The 'Making Fair Decisions' Policy re local spending is not currently built into the impact assessment process.

5. In reference to M656 % of Health Visitor (HV) mandated reviews completed within timescale.

Query: the committee asked for clarification of the numbers of new HV being recruited.

Response: There are challenges to filling Health Visitor vacancies that are not restricted to Oldham. Most services report difficulties in recruiting trained staff. Similar issues are experienced across the Northern Care Alliance, other GM providers, and nationally there are some areas offering financial incentives to attract health visitors.

Oldham has recruited 7 new fully qualified health visitors in the last twelve months. There is an open advert for health visiting recruitment offering flexible hours and working patterns. Recruitment for the next cohort of health visitor students will begin in April for commencement in September. This is the Specialist Community Public Health Practitioner (SCPHN) training. Traditionally our students have done well on this and in the last year 6 SCPHN students successfully secured positions as health visitors.

In addition, we have implemented a "grow our own" approach to developing the workforce alongside open recruitment for health visitors. The service has recruited five Band 5 nurses to the health visitor teams to gain knowledge and understanding of the public health role. This will put them in good stead to undertake the Specialist Community Public Health Practitioner (SCPHN) training. On completion of the SCPHN training they will be employed as health visitors within the service.

6. Issues to be covered by a specific report as part of the Committee's work programme:

- contract monitoring arrangements for the EON CLP contract
- analysis of workforce absence and churn trends and outline of any remedial actions being taken to address these issues
- Children's Services - update on financial performance and Improvement Plan / Repeat Referrals in Children's Social Care

These will be coordinated by constitutional services pick that up and request a report to the meeting either in February or March – see [committees.oldham.gov.uk/Performance work programme 2022-23 DRAFT](https://committees.oldham.gov.uk/Performance%20work%20programme%202022-23%20DRAFT) for details

DRAFT